



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS DIVISION
CENTER FOR FAMILIES, CHILDREN & THE COURTS

ACCESS TO VISITATION GRANT PROGRAM
REQUEST-FOR-PROPOSALS GRANT APPLICATION
WEBINAR SESSIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2021–2022 THROUGH 2023–2024

APPLICANT QUESTIONS (September 18, 2020)

**No Questions were Received for September 4 and September 11, 2020*

Question 1: Should the narrative be single or double spaced?

Response 1: The RFP grant application does not mention spacing guidelines. The applicant may select to use either single or double spacing in the RFP application narrative fillable form.

Question 2: On the RFP the Abstract/Cover pages do not fit the court contacts, Titles or addresses (actually almost none of the boxes). We went ahead and filled it out thinking it would correct with the printing, but the filled boxes do not print out either if it goes any longer than 14 characters. Is there a fix?

Response 2: There is no limit to the number of characters that can be entered into the fillable form. The applicant should use the scroll bars if the applicant wants to see what they entered.

Role	Superior Court	Contact Name	Title	Address	Telephon
Lead Court	Court -	1234567891011	12345678910	XXXXXXXXXX	
Partner Court	Court -				

The fillable form is set up so that the only way to view the information is to use the scroll bar arrows when lengthy text is added so the applicant can see all the text. Printing will not allow the applicant to see all the text entered. Because the text does not display if printed, if you are planning to use a hand-written or “wet” signature to sign the application, we suggest you only print out the signature page to do so, scan, and combine with the fillable pdf version to submit or use an e-signature. Please refer to the previously posted FAQs under Question 13 for more information, click [here](#).

Question 3: How do I modify the form to put the lead court name in the footer? Are we allowed to bust into it to modify the footer?

Response 3: The RFP Grant Application fillable form cannot be modified. The applicant should submit two separate files as part of the applicant courts application: (1) the pdf application form; and (2) the court/subcontractor excel budget form. **Because the RFP grant application fillable form cannot be modified, the applicant does not need to include a footer or number the pages.**

Question 4: As I prepare the assembling of the AV RFP, I want to make sure I have all the required sections. I remember past years applications required several exhibits signed by the sub-contractors. This doesn't appear to be the requirement with this year's RFP application. In fact, the instructions only reference submitting the application and the budget. Is this correct? I'm guessing that the exhibits will be required if the court is selected as a participant in the AV grant.

Response 4: The applicant should follow the requirements outlined in the RFP Grant Application under section 3.0—Grant Application Submission Instructions. This includes section 3.1 (How to Apply) and section 3.2 (Instructions and Deadlines for Submission of Grant Application Proposals). In addition, yes, there are additional exhibits the applicant will be required to complete if selected for grant funding.

Question 5: If we propose one of the grant-related services, such as parent education with our supervised visitation program, and the court changes its mind and does not want to provide parent education after all, and—assuming we are selected for funding—is the court obligated to provide the parent education services?

Response 5: No. If the superior court is selected for funding and the court subsequently determines that they no longer want to provide the parent education services and only supervised visitation services, this would be acceptable. However, it would not be acceptable, if for example, the superior court submits a grant application for supervised visitation service only, and after being selected for funding, subsequently wants to add the grant-related service of parent education. Because the RFP grant application review process, in this case, was based solely on the evaluation of the superior court's proposal, that only included supervised visitation services and not parent education, the change would not be permitted.